

Regarding the packed nanoparticles, Fig. 14 of Shipwash shows that particles are *not* packed and stationary in a second channel. In fact, paragraph [0425] (which is included in Example 15) states that the components *flow past a detector*, those components being the beads/nanoparticles and bound-sample. If the particles flow past the detector they cannot at the same time be packed and stationary within a channel. The other paragraphs recited in the Action do not teach packed nanoparticles as alleged: i.e., [0066], describes nanoparticles and that reactions are carried out on the surface of such nanoparticles; [0167], provides a generalized discussion of microfluidics and microsystem fabrication; and [0174], discusses amino acid detection. In short, Shipway fails to teach or suggest the limitation “wherein the plurality of cross-linked nanoparticles aggregates affixed within the second channel are packed and stationary within the second channel” Furthermore, Shipway is also silent with respect to nanoparticle aggregates affixed within a channel, wherein the plurality of cross-linked nanoparticles aggregates affixed within the second channel are packed and stationary within the second channel, as the amended claims presently recite. In light of the amendment of claim 26, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn as Shipwash and Shipway do not teach or suggest this invention *as a whole*.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/
Raj S. Davé
Registration No.: 42,465
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation